



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,974	06/10/2004	Heping Shang	SYB/0105.00	3973

31779 7590 01/29/2007  
JOHN A. SMART  
708 BLOSSOM HILL RD., #201  
LOS GATOS, CA 95032-3503

EXAMINER
----------

PULLIAM, CHRISTYANN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2165

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/29/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/709,974

Applicant(s)

SHANG ET AL.

Examiner

Christyann Pulliam

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Claims 1-44 are pending as amended
2. Applicant's has overcome objections to the abstract, the speciation, claim heading and the claim numbering.
3. Applicant's arguments filed November 17, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's amendment has not overcome the objections and rejections listed below. Therefore, this action is made FINAL.

***Claim Objections***

4. Claims 1, 12, 23, 35, 37, 38, 43 and 44 are objected to because of the following informality: intended use statements. The use of the word "for" followed by a verb creates an intended use statement that does not provide a limiting function. These claims should be reworded using terms that require the element or potential functional limitation. Appropriate correction is required.
5. Claim 1 and 23 is objected to because of the following informality: optional statements. The phrases like "so that", "may be" and "should be" state possible

Art Unit: 2165

capabilities but does not require them. See MPEP § 2111.04. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The use of the word "efficiently" makes the claim vague and indefinite. Efficiency is an opinion that is not quantifiable. Therefore, it cannot be determined what is included within the scope of the claim. Accordingly, Claim 1 is indefinite.

8. Claims 1, 23, 43 and 44, and all other claims by dependence on these claims, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The amendments to the claims seem to contradict information in the specification.

First, the requirement that the lists comprise wildcard and negation information differs from the description in the specification. Comprising means "including at least". However, in the specification, neither negation information or wildcards are required.

The system can handle both but neither is required (See PGPub paragraphs [0088-0091]). A subscriber can subscribe to a published item without using wildcards or negation information. Additionally, the phrasing of the claims seems to say the index is build based on a list of subscribers with entries indicating subscriber for each item in the list and a default list of subscribers. If the list is described as containing data on what the subscriber is interested in or not interest in, then why would there be a default list of subscriber in the list of subscriber interests. The use of the word "indicating" also makes the claim unclear. The item is either in the list or its not; it is not a matter of indicating. It is also confusing whether the entries indicate subscribers or the wildcard and negation information indicate subscribers. The specification seems to say that the wildcard and negation information can be used in the published items subscribed to. Contrary to the specification, the claims seem to say that the wildcard and negation information indicates subscribers not the published item. The list is also of subscribers so the description that the lists indicate "subscribers for each item of data in the lists" does not make sense. It would seem to be the other way around based on the specification. It is unclear which of the elements in the build module/building step describe the index and which describe the list that the index is built on. The way the claim is written the entire step describes the list on which the index is built. However, according to the specification (PGPub paragraph [0077]), some of the details apply to the index not the list. For example, the default list is in the index not the list.

Next, the resolution module/steps after building also are unclear. If the subscribers are databases, then how would an item be displayed to the database. The

Art Unit: 2165

addition of the requirement of "constant time" also makes the claim unclear. The index as described in a hash table which is still a list that must be searched for the published item. Once the item is found, then the subscribers are all known. The search time seems to still depend on the number of published items in the index, even though the number of subscribers does not matter. It is unclear how the search of the index can be done in constant time since the time would seem to depend on the number of published items in the index. Therefore, the examiner is unable to fully ascertain the meaning of constant time. Also, due to the optional and intended use language in the claims, it is unclear what is actually required by them and what would fall within the scope of the claims. Accordingly, Claims 1-44 are indefinite.

9. Claims 18, 19 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. When an "if" is used there must also be an "else" to provide what happens when the condition is not met (as done in Claim 23 with "if" and "otherwise"). Alternatively, in some situations the "if" can be changed to "when".

10. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 44 has been amended in a way that seems to add downloading as a step in the method that the instructions being is downloading will perform.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

11. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

12. Claims 1-22 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claims are directed toward non-statutory material.

13. Claims 1-22 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claims are functional descriptive material. The system in Claim 1 is software per se, which is functional descriptive material and therefore non-statutory. Claim 1 lacks the necessary physical structure to be a machine or article of manufacture. Claims 2-22 depend from Claim 1 and do not add any physical structure. Therefore, Claims 2-22 are also functional descriptive material. Additionally, Claim 44 is software per se, which is functional descriptive matter. It lacks the necessary physical structure to make it an article of manufacture or a machine. Claims 1-22 and 44 are directed to non-statutory material.

14. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claims lack a tangible result. The final action in Claim 1 is "determining subscribers". This "determining" is not a tangible result. Claims 2-22 do not add a tangible result to the system of Claim 1. There is no tangible result that would make the determination useful. Therefore, Claims 1-22 are non-statutory.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

15. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

16. Claims 1-8, 12, 22-28, 38 and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zarmer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,625,818 (hereinafter Zarmer) and in view of Collison, U.S. PGPub No. 2004/0139166 (hereinafter Collison).

As for Claim 1, Zarmer teaches:

A system for determining subscribers to which a published item of data should be replicated, the system comprising:

an interface module (See e.g. Zarmer - col. 5, lines 2-10 and col. 7, lines 5-10) for receiving user input of lists of a plurality of subscribers, each list specifying items of data to be replicated to a given subscriber (See e.g. Zarmer - subscribing col. 13, lines 2-10);

a build module for building an index based on the lists of the plurality of subscribers containing comprising negation information entries indicating subscribers for each item of data specified in the lists (See e.g. Zarmer - ObjectMan can search list so it was built – col. 11, lines 12-38, can unsubscribe - col. 4, line 66- col.5, line 7 and 26-45, and RemoveInterestedView – col. 14, lines 22-27 and RemoveInterestedParties



Art Unit: 2165

col. 28, line 65- col. 29, line 35) and a default list of subscribers for items of data not matching any of the entries (See e.g. Zarmer -auto-interest col. 22, lines 42-53); and a resolution module for receiving a published item of data and determining in constant time subscribers to which the published item should be replicated based on the index, so that said published item may be efficiently replicated for display to subscribers (See e.g. Zarmer -ObjectMan – col. 11; lines 12-38).

Zarmer does not teach wildcards. However, Collison teaches building entries including a wildcard for indicating all items of data of a certain type should be replicated to a subscriber (See e.g. Collison - paragraphs [0026-0031]).

Zarmer and Collison are from the analogous art of communicating with remote computers and databases from a main server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Zarmer and Collison. The motivation to combine Zarmer and Collison comes from the common goal of efficient communication of data to multiple computers over a network. Zarmer and Collison allow computers to subscribe to receive data or messages that they have an interest in receiving. Collison adds flexibility to the Zarmer system by allowing the use of wildcards in the subscribing process. Wildcards are a common tool to allow clients to find things without being precise in their selections. Since the subscribers to the Zarmer system would naturally want to subscribe to all topics in their interest areas not just the ones they knew the exact names of, it would be logical to use the common tool of wildcards as presented in Collison.

As for Claim 2, Zarmer as modified by above also teaches:

The system of claim 1, wherein a subscriber comprises a replicate database (See e.g. Zarmer - IP is subscriber database col. 9, line 17-60 and col. 16, lines 52-64 and Claim 1 – second database portion is a substantial replica of the first).

As or Claim 3, Zarmer as modified by above also teaches:

The system of claim 1, wherein a published item of data comprises an item of data published by a primary database for replication (See e.g. Zarmer -CS is publisher database col. 9, line 17-60, col. 7, lines 5-10 and col. 8, lines 32-40 and Claims 1 and 2).

As for Claim 4, Zarmer as modified by above also teaches:

The system of claim 1, wherein the lists of the plurality of subscribers include a list specifying at least one item of data not to be replicated to a particular subscriber (See e.g. Zarmer -RemoveInterestedView – col. 14, lines 22-27 and RemoveInterestedParties col. 28, line 65- col. 29, line 35).

As for Claim 5, Zarmer as modified by above also teaches:

The system of claim 1, wherein the lists of the plurality of subscribers include a list comprising a negation set indicating that all data other than items specified on the list should be replicated to a particular subscriber (See e.g. Zarmer -col. 4, line 66-

col.5, line 7 and 26-45, and RemoveInterestedView – col. 14, lines 22-27 and RemoveInterestedParties col. 28, line 65- col. 29, line 35).

As for Claim 6, Zarmer as modified by above also teaches:

The system of claim 1, wherein the interface module receives at least one string identifying data to be replicated to a subscriber (See e.g. Zarmer -AddInterestedView col. 14, lines 20-23 and col. 13, lines 3-8 and AddInterestedParties col. 28, line 65- col. 29, line 35).).

As for Claim 7, Zarmer as modified by above also teaches:

The system of claim 6, wherein the build module builds the index based, at least in part, on said at least one string (See e.g. Zarmer -ObjectMan – col. 11, lines 12-38).

As for Claim 8, Zarmer as modified by above also teaches:

The system of claim 7, wherein the index includes an entry representing a particular item of data and at least one subscriber to which the particular item of data is to be replicated (See e.g. Zarmer -ObjectMan – col. 11, lines 12-38).

As for Claim 12, Zarmer as modified by above teaches the system of Claim 1. Collison also teaches an entry including a wildcard for indicating all items of data of a certain type should be replicated to subscribers of said entry (See e.g. Collison - paragraphs [0026-0031]).

As for Claim 22, Zarmer as modified by above also teaches:

The system of claim 1, wherein the build module removes a subscriber from the index in response to a request to remove a subscriber (See e.g. Zarmer - RemoveInterestedView – col. 14, lines 22-27).

As for Claims 23, 43 and 44, Zarmer teaches:

A method for determining subscribers to which a published item of data should be replicated, the method comprising:

receiving lists of a plurality of subscribers, each list specifying items of data to be replicated to a given subscriber (See e.g. Zarmer -subscribing col. 13, lines 2-10);

building an index based on said lists of the plurality of subscribers containing entries comprising negation information indicating subscribers to which each item of data specified in said lists should be replicated (See e.g. Zarmer - ObjectMan can search list so it was built – col. 11, lines 12-38, can unsubscribe - col. 4, line 66- col.5, line 7 and 26-45, and RemoveInterestedView – col. 14, lines 22-27 and RemoveInterestedParties col. 28, line 65- col. 29, line 35) and a default list for indicating subscribers to published items of data not matching any of the index entries (See e.g. Zarmer - auto-interest col. 22, lines 42-53);

given a published item of data, determining in constant time whether the published item matches at least one entry in the index (See e.g. Zarmer -ObjectMan can search list so it was built – col. 11, lines 12-38);

if the published item matches at least one entry, generating a set of subscribers to which the published item should be replicated based on the subscribers associated with said at least one entry (See e.g. Zarmer -ObjectMan can search list so it was built – col. 11, lines 12-38 and AutoBroadcast col. 15, lines 24-30); and

otherwise, returning the default list of subscribers to which the published item should be replicated (See e.g. Zarmer -col. 22, lines 43-50).

Zarmer does not teach wildcards. However, Collison teaches building entries including a wildcard for indicating all items of data of a certain type should be replicated to a subscriber (See e.g. Collison - paragraphs [0026-0031]). The motivation to combine Collison and Zarmer is stated above in Claim 1.

As for Claim 24, Zarmer as modified by above also teaches:

The method of claim 23, wherein a subscriber comprises a replicate database (See e.g. Zarmer- IP is subscriber database col. 9, line 17-60 and col. 16, lines 52-64 64 and Claim 1 – second database portion is a substantial replica of the first).

As for Claim 25, Zarmer as modified by above also teaches:

The method of claim 23, wherein a published item of data comprises an item of data published by a primary database for replication (See e.g. Zarmer -CS is publisher database col. 9, line 17-60, col. 7, lines 5-10 and col. 8, lines 32-40 and Claims 1 and 2).

As for Claim 26, Zarmer as modified by above also teaches:

The method of claim 23, wherein said receiving step includes specifying items of data not to be replicated to a subscriber (See e.g. Zarmer -RemoveInterestedView – col. 14, lines 22-27 and RemoveInterestedParties col. 28, line 65- col. 29, line 35).

As for Claim 27, Zarmer as modified by above also teaches:

The method of claim 23, wherein said receiving step includes receiving a list comprising a negation set indicating that all data other than items specified on the list should be replicated to a subscriber (See e.g. Zarmer -col. 4, line 66- col.5, line 7 and 26-45, and RemoveInterestedView – col. 14, lines 22-27 and RemoveInterestedParties col. 28, line 65- col. 29, line 35).

As for Claim 28, Zarmer as modified by above also teaches:

The method of claim 23, wherein said receiving step includes receiving at least one string identifying data to be replicated to a subscriber (See e.g. Zarmer -ObjectMan – col. 11, lines 12-38).

As for Claim 38, Zarmer as modified by above teaches the system of Claim 23. Collison also teaches building entries including a wildcard for indicating all items of data of a certain type should be replicated to a subscriber (See e.g. Collison - paragraphs [0026-0031]).

As for Claim 42, Zarmer as modified by above also teaches the determining step includes building a list of subscribers based upon a plurality of matching entries (See e.g. col. 11, lines 30-38).

17. Claims 9-11, 13-19, 20-21, 29-37 and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zarmer in view of Collison as applied above, and in further view of Pedrizetti et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,151,708 (hereinafter Pedrizetti).

As for Claim 9, Zarmer as modified teaches the system of claim 1. Zarmer does not teach the use of a hash table. However, Pedrizetti teaches a hash table of entries based on the lists of the plurality of subscribers (See e.g. Pedrizetti - Claim 2 and col. 4, lines 55-58).

Zarmer and Pedrizetti are from the analogous art of updating remote computers and databases from a main server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Zarmer and Pedrizetti. Zarmer and Collison are from the analogous art of communicating with remote computers and databases from a main server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Zarmer and Collison.

The motivation to combine Zarmer and Pedrizetti comes from the common goal of efficient automation. Zarmer discusses the problems with manually tracking

Art Unit: 2165

published data (See col. 1, lines 30-55). Pedrizetti discusses the issues with large updates and version control (See col. 1, lines 12-40). Both try to overcome these issues by automating the version control and data transfers over networks to interested computers. Pedrizetti adds the well-known hash table to the file transfer system of Zarmer in order to determine which data goes to which interest client computer. Zarmer and Pedrizetti allow a server computer to publish data to client computers that have expressed an interest in the data in an efficient automated process.

The motivation to combine Zarmer and Collison comes from the common goal of efficient communication of data to multiple computers over a network. Zarmer and Collison allow computers to subscribe to receive data or messages that they have an interest in receiving. Collison adds flexibility to the Zarmer system by allowing the use of wildcards in the subscribing process. Wildcards are a common tool to allow clients to find things without being precise in their selections. Since the subscribers to the Zarmer system would naturally want to subscribe to all topics in their interest areas not just the ones they knew the exact names of, it would be logical to use the common tool of wildcards as presented in Collison.

As for Claim 10, Zarmer teaches the system of Claim 1. Zarmer does not teach a bitmap string. However, Pedrizetti teaches a bitmap string representing subscribers to which an item of data is to be replicated (See e.g. Pedrizetti - col. 4, lines 1-13 and 50-54).



As for Claim 11, Zarmer teaches the system of Claim 1. Zarmer does not teach a bitmap string. However, Pedrizetti teaches the bitmap string includes one bit for each subscriber (See e.g. Pedrizetti - col. 5, lines 26-45 and col. 4, lines 50-54).

As for Claim 13, Zarmer teaches the system of Claim 1. Zarmer does not teach a bitmap string. However, Pedrizetti teaches a bitmap string representing the default list of subscribers (See e.g. Pedrizetti - client is subscriber - col. 3, lines 40-57 and col. 4, line 66- col.5, line 7).

As for Claim 14, Zarmer as modified above teaches the system of Claims 1 and 13. Zarmer does not teach adding subscribers to the list. However, Pedrizetti teaches adding each subscriber having a list comprising a whole set to the bitmap string representing the default list of subscribers (See e.g. Pedrizetti - col. 4, line 66- col.5, line 7 and 26-45).

As for Claim 15, Zarmer as modified above teaches the system of Claims 1 and 13. Zarmer does not teach adding subscribers to the list. However, Pedrizetti teaches adding each subscriber having a list comprising a negation set to the bitmap string representing the default list of subscribers (See e.g. Pedrizetti - col. 4, line 66- col.5, line 7 and 26-45).

As for Claim 16, Zarmer teaches the system of Claim 1. Zarmer does not teach a hash value for items to be published. However, Pedrizetti teaches a hashed value based on at least one string identifying the published item (See e.g. Pedrizetti - col. 4, lines 1-17, 55-59).

As for Claim 17, Zarmer as modified above teaches the system of Claims 1 and 16. Zarmer does not teach a hash value for items to be published. However, Pedrizetti teaches searches for the hashed value in the index (See e.g. Pedrizetti - col. 5, lines 7-45).

As for Claim 18, Zarmer as modified above teaches the system of Claims 1 and 17. Zarmer does not teach a hash value for items to be published. However, Pedrizetti teaches determines subscribers to which the published item should be replicated based upon at least one entry in the index including the hashed value if the hashed value is found in the index (See e.g. Pedrizetti - col. 5, lines 7-45 and col. 6, lines 45-48).

As for Claim 19, Zarmer as modified above teaches the system of Claims 1 and 17. Zarmer does not teach a hash value for items to be published. However, Pedrizetti teaches determining subscribers to which the published item should be replicated based upon the default list if the hashed value is not found in the index (See e.g. Pedrizetti - col. 3, lines 5-41).

As for Claim 20, Zarmer as modified above teaches the system of Claims 1 and 16. Collison also teaches a plurality of strings identifying the published item and substitutes a wildcard for one of the strings to search for matching entries in the index which include a wildcard (See e.g. Collison - paragraphs [0026-0031]).

As for Claim 21, Zarmer teaches the system of Claim 1. Zarmer does not teach a hash value for items to be published. However, Pedrizetti teaches determining subscribers to which the published item should be replicated based upon the default list of subscribers for published items without matching entries in the index (See e.g. Pedrizetti - col. 3, lines 5-41).

As for Claim 29, Zarmer teaches the system of Claims 23 and 28. Zarmer does not teach a hash table. However, Pedrizetti teaches building a hash table based on said at least one string (See e.g. Pedrizetti - Claim 2 and col. 4, lines 55-58).

As for Claim 30, Zarmer as modified above teaches the system of Claims 23, 28 and 29. Zarmer does not teach a bitmap string. However, Pedrizetti teaches building a bitmap string for each entry representing subscribers to an item of data (See e.g. Pedrizetti - col. 4, lines 1-13 and 50-54).

As for Claim 31, Zarmer teaches the system of Claim 23. Zarmer does not teach a hash table. However, Pedrizetti teaches building a hash table of entries (See e.g. Pedrizetti - Claim 2 and col. 4, lines 55-58).

As for Claim 32, Zarmer teaches the system of Claim 23. Zarmer does not teach a bitmap string. However, Pedrizetti teaches generating a bitmap string representing subscribers to an item of data (See e.g. Pedrizetti -col. 4, lines 1-13 and 50-54).

As for Claim 33, Zarmer as modified above teaches the system of Claims 23 and 32. Zarmer does not teach a bitmap string. However, Pedrizetti teaches generating a bitmap string having one bit for each subscriber (See e.g. Pedrizetti -col. 5, lines 26-45 and col. 4, lines 50-54).

As for Claim 34, Zarmer as modified above teaches the system of Claims 23 and 32. Zarmer also teaches wherein said step of generating a bitmap string includes removing a subscriber from the bitmap string representing subscribers to an item of data if the subscriber has specified the item of data as an excluded item in a negation set (See e.g. Zarmer - col. 4, line 66- col.5, line 7 and 26-45, and RemoveInterestedView – col. 14, lines 22-27 and RemoveInterestedParties col. 28, line 65- col. 29, line 35).

As for Claim 35, Zarmer teaches the system of Claim 23. Zarmer does not teach a bitmap string. However, Pedrizetti teaches building a bitmap string for representing the default list of subscribers (See e.g. Pedrizetti - client is subscriber - col. 3, lines 40-57 and col. 4, line 66- col.5, line 7).

As for Claim 36, Zarmer as modified above teaches the system of Claims 23 and 35. Zarmer does not teach a bitmap string. However, Pedrizetti teaches the step of building a bitmap string for representing the default list of subscribers includes adding each subscriber having a list comprising a whole set (See e.g. Pedrizetti - col. 4, line 66- col.5, line 7 and 26-45).

As for Claim 37, Zarmer as modified above teaches the system of Claims 23 and 35. Zarmer does not teach a bitmap string. However, Pedrizetti teaches the step of building a bitmap string for representing the default list of subscribers includes adding each subscriber having a list comprising a negation set (See e.g. Pedrizetti - col. 4, line 66- col.5, line 7 and 26-45).

As for Claim 39, Zarmer teaches the system of Claim 23. Zarmer does not teach a hashed value. However, Pedrizetti teaches the determining step includes generating a hashed value based on at least one string identifying the published item (See e.g. Pedrizetti - col. 4, lines 1-17, 55-59).

As for Claim 40, Zarmer as modified above teaches the system of Claims 23 and 39. Zarmer does not teach a hashed value. However, Pedrizetti teaches the determining step includes searching for the hashed value in the index (See e.g. Pedrizetti - col. 5, lines 7-45).

As for Claim 41, Zarmer as modified above teaches the system of Claims 23 and 38. Collison also teaches a plurality of strings identifying the published item and substitutes a wildcard for one of the strings to search for matching entries in the index which include a wildcard (See e.g. Collison - paragraphs [0026-0031]).

### ***Response to Arguments***

18. Applicant's arguments filed November 17, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

19. Claim objections and 112 rejections are added based on the amended claims.

20. In regards to the 101 rejections, the amendments to the claims do not overcome the rejections. There are two separate 101 issues: software per se and lack of a tangible result. First, as for the software per se issue, software alone cannot be patented. It must be claimed in conjunction with a proper computer-readable medium or hardware. See MPEP § 2106. Claims 1-22 and 44 are software. The system of Claims

Art Unit: 2165

1-22 can be fully implemented in software. Claim 44 is a product-type claim that claims instruction not a method with a physical element. It is therefore also software. The claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*. Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because "[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer."). See MPEP § 2106. Next, in regards to the lack of a tangible result for Claims 1-22, the amendments do not cure the rejection because the replication/display of the published item is an optional and intended use. The tangible

Art Unit: 2165

replication and sending of the item to the subscriber is not required by the claim.

Accordingly, Claims 1-22 and 44 are not statutory matter.

21. In regards to the prior art rejections and arguments, the Applicant's arguments are general but the claims do not express the differences argued. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). For example, on page 21 of the arguments, Applicant argues that the invention "can resolve with one hit the exact subscribers the item is to be distributed to, even though the item itself was not known". While this might be true, the claims do not include the limitation, especially not the independent claims. Also, on page 22, the argument is made that the prior art is based only on "already-known information". However, nothing in the claims states that the invention uses anything other than known information. Even the use of wildcards for areas of interest does not mean that the published item is unknown. Applicant's other main argument is that the invention works in "constant time", not a linear search or hash, which is different than the prior art. The examiner disagrees because the index as described in a hash table which is still a list that must be searched for the published item. Once the item is found, then the subscribers are all known. The search time seems to still depend on the number of published items in the index, even though the number of subscribers does not matter. It is unclear how the search of the index can be done in constant time or in one hit since the time would seem to depend on the number of published items in the index. The



Art Unit: 2165

claims are further confused by the use of intended use language. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Therefore, the examiner is unable to fully ascertain the meaning of constant time.

22. In regards to the 103 rejections and arguments, Applicant argues that the additional references do not overcome the deficiencies of Zarmer argued. The examiner disagrees because for the reasons stated above Zarmer does not have the deficiencies argued. Additionally, while Zarmer does not teach wildcards, Collison does teach wildcards used in the topics that a subscribers wants to subscribe to. The lists on which the index of the invention is built allows the subscriber to use wildcards is the same way to select the published items that the subscriber is interested in.

23. Therefore, Claims 1-8, 12, 22-28, 38 and 42-44 are unpatentable over Zarmer in view of Collison and Claims 9-11, 13-19, 20-21, 29-37 and 39-41 unpatentable over Zarmer in view of Collison and Pedrizetti.

***Conclusion***

24. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christyann Pulliam whose telephone number is 571-270-1007. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8:30am-6pm, every other Fri 8:30am-5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on (571) 272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2165

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CRFP

CRFP

Etienne T. Lhousse  
primary examiner